U.S. Coast Guard 33 CFR Part 103 USCG-2003-14733 -/ 2 Area Maritime Security

The following pages 63 thru 73; are a portion of the transcript of the Public Meeting, held on Wednesday, July 23, 2003. The meeting was held at 9:00 a.m. in the Constitution Rooms A and B of the Grand Hyatt, 1000 H Street, NW, Washington, D.C., RADM Larry Hereth, Director of Port Security, presiding. This portion of the transcript pertains to Area Maritime Security.

Please note: The entire transcript is posted in Docket #USCG-2003-14792

reinforce our concern with this. More so since nowhere in the docket the logic of this decision is explained. So thank you for the time. And we will submit -- we have comments submitted in the box here. Thanks.

CDR ENGLEBERT: Thank you. We'll move forward. We're now going to open the floor for discussion on Part 103, Area Maritime Security. I'd like you to limit your comments at this time to Subpart A, Subpart B and Subpart C. Subpart A is the general requirements. It includes the applicability of this section and the definitions for this particular section. Subpart B covers the designation of the federal maritime security coordinator, the authority of the Captain of the Port as the federal maritime security coordinator. And Subpart C covers the Area Maritime Security Committee. This Subpart discusses the Committee, its composition and its responsibilities. The floor is open for this discussion.

ADM. NORTH: Good morning again. Bob North, Lloyd's Register North America. Section 103.300, Area Maritime Security Committee, specifically 103.300(b), specifies that the AMS operates under a written charter but it's not

NEAL R. GROSS

specified who the chartering entity is.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

Second, with regard to the area maritime security plan, the plan as described regulations will contain information impacting ship operations that company security officers and ship security officers should know in order for ships in their security plans to fully complement AMS plans, which are SSI protected. A provision should be made for reasonable access by CSOs and SSOs to AMS plan information on a need to know basis relevant to their operations for those that have an SSI clearance and/or perhaps a synopsis of pertinent information provisions of the AMS be made available to CSO and SSO use, again, on a need to know basis pertinent to their operations with an SSI clearance. Thank you.

MR. HEDRICK: Good morning, Admiral, Commander and ladies and gentlemen. I'm Bill Hedrick with Rowan Drilling Company of Houston, and I'm here representing Rowan as well as the Offshore Operators Committee. My comment is very brief on the AMS plan. We simply wish to thank the Coast Guard for recognizing the unique operating characteristics of our industry in mandating the 8th District establish an offshore or outer continental shelf area plan. Industry is committed to going forward to populate the

NEAL R. GROSS

Committee as well as timely producing the AMS plan, and we hope that this process begins soonest. Thank you.

MR. SPACKMAN: Alan Spackman, International Association of Drilling Contractors. would second Mr. Hedrick's comments regarding the need to timely establish the AMS or the offshore outer continental shelf portion in the Gulf of Mexico. also would express some concern with respect to the Coast Guard's statements in its regulations that existing port safety committees, port security committees would be recognized. While we see the need for the continuity that the Coast Guard's trying to establish, we would question whether these committees have taken into account the much broader scope of application of the MTSA as opposed preexistent concerns over port safety and security. Thank you.

MR. VOLKLE: Skip Volkle from Maritrans again since this is a different docket. I just want to reiterate my comments with respect -- that I made earlier about our concerns about the lack of Coast Guard authority offshore to deal with security incidents, establish security and safety zones and also the jurisdictional conflict between the various

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

agencies who are attempting to respond to a security incident. Those jurisdictional limits need to be clarified. And from our perspective, from the marine sector, we think that the Coast Guard ought to be the lead agency in responding to a security and/or safety incident involving vessels offshore. Thank you.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Lindsay McLaughlin, International Longshore & Warehouse Union. We note in Section 103.305 the composition of Area Maritime Security Committees. Our Union members have been asked to participate in local port security committees up and down the west coast that have made a valuable contribution already. We would request that labor, workers' labor representatives of, or port organizations be included in the composition of these committees. Thank you.

MR. KICE: My name is Mike Kice. I'm with P&O Ports. I have participated in one of the committees in the Gulf Port area. It's a small community, and I would encourage you to allow private industry to be as involved as you can in the committees. It's really brought the community together on our maritime side, law enforcement, Customs, fire departments all have gotten a forum to discuss the different issues, and it really has worked

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

in that area. Thank you.

2.3

MR. STIER: I'm Kevin Stier, and I'm actually a member of the Area Maritime Security Committees, and I want to recognize that some of these committees should have also passenger vessels members on them. Some of them many not in some of the local areas. Because that's the committee that's going to regulate the T-boats and the smaller charter boats, and I think it's important to have that representation so that they have a voice in how they're regulated under these port security plans.

RADM HERETH: What committee are you a member of?

MR. STIER: The St. Louis Committee of the Ouad Cities.

NACO. We agree with everything that's been said here so far, and we would encourage you to utilize -- NACO has extensive research and database on the social and economic impact of charter boats in the United States. Our membership ranges from Alaska to the Gulf of Mexico to Maine, and we would encourage you to utilize that resource and involve us in your committees so that you can get that type of information to work with your benefit/risk assessments and what not to get a

NEAL R. GROSS

good, clear picture on what will happen to the social and economic impact of the local communities on the waterways. Thank you.

MR. ANTAL: Jim Antal, Port of Tacoma. The AMS committees are supposed to address rules for handling and protecting classified, sensitive security, commercial sensitive and proprietary information. I believe that there has to be a uniform addressing of these matters simply because of the information that has to be distributed to many people. The information is critical across the board to many people in the maritime community, not just the people on the committee itself. I don't believe that the handling of SSI -- I know the Coast Guard is working on coming up with some clarification on this, but I believe it's got to be uniform across the board, and I'm not sure the committees are the ones to decide those things. So I just want to point that out. Thank you.

CDR ENGLEBERT: Seeing no further comment we'll move to Subpart D and Subpart E of Part 103. Subpart D includes area maritime security assessment, general requirements, the elements of the assessment and the persons involved in conducting the assessment. Subpart E talks to the area maritime security plan

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

requirements, the elements that the plan must contain, the review and approval requirements for these plans, the exercise of these plans and the record keeping requirements for them. The floor is now open for comments on Subpart D and E or Part 103.

You're going to make me PRAZAK: lonely up here. My name is James Prazak, I'm with the Dow Chemical Company, and I want to make a point about the port vulnerability assessments for the area plan. In many cases, facilities and vessels, and particular facilities like ours that are part of the chemical industry and active members of the American Chemistry Council, have already been required to go through and do our vulnerability assessments for our facilities, and we're actively involved to the enhancements to our requirements for the facilities. So we've gone through and done all this effort on the vulnerability assessments. Well, just yesterday I received a questionnaire from one of my facilities already been through a vulnerability that's assessment, but this is for the area vulnerability assessment, and it's a 25-page packet that we have to go through and fill out. It makes me wonder why we've done ours if now we're having to go do another one to provide all this information.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	Again, a lot of the information is
2	sensitive from a commercial standpoint and from a
3	security standpoint. We don't really like the idea of
4	releasing our vulnerability assessment, because,
5	again, that's inherent to the security of our
6	facility, but there's got to be a way to mesh all that
7	together so that we don't go out and repeat a bunch of
8	work. And so I guess my suggestion is if there would
9	be a possibility on a national level of getting some
10	stakeholders together, both from the port side and the
11	Coast Guard, from the local areas and some industry
12	and try to figure out how we can mesh all that
13	together so that we're not doing rework but we're
14	still meeting the needs of the area plan. Thank you.
15	RADM HERETH: I'm sorry, please tell us
16	who you got the 25-page document from.
17	MR. PRAZAK: It's one of my facilities out
18	on the east coast.
19	RADM HERETH: And who did they receive it
20	from?
21	MR. PRAZAK: It actually came from a
22	contractor working for the Area Committee. I don't
23	know the exact company, because I haven't actually
24	gone through all the nit-picky details of it. I've
25	got it here in my folder. If you'd like, I can come

up during the break and show it to you. Thank you.

MR. SPACKMAN: Alan Spackman, International Association of Drilling Contractors. I would express some concern regarding the use of the terminology, "port, within the AMS requirements. It implies a geographic area much more limited structure than it seems that the plans are meant to apply to and may be confusing to some people trying to figure it whether it applies to them or not.

CAPT. ZALES: Bob Zales, II, Chairman of NACO once again. Just to reiterate on what I've stated before and particularly Subpart D, we would encourage the use of, like I said, our organization plus the many, and this was clearly stated earlier by another gentleman, the vast number of recreational fishermen that are -- or recreational boaters that are on our waterways in these committees for the purposes of determining the best local knowledge for the areas that you're going to deal with. There's a vast number of recreational boaters out there that are willing to help and have tons of advice and knowledge that they're able to give you, and we would encourage the use of that in any way possible. If you have to advertise in local newspapers, media, whatever, how you need to do it to get their participation, they're

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

more than willing to do it. In many cases, they're just not aware of how to get involved. So if you will involve them, the system should work a whole lot better. Thank you.

MR. HEDRICK: Good morning again. Bill Hedrick with Rowan. One other point, if you don't mind, on Part B, on the AMS Committee structure and composition. We respectfully suggest the that requirement of a minimum five years involvement or management be stricken and rather substitute some wording or verbiage to the effect that they must have at least five years of port, maritime or offshore oil and gas experience. We believe by changing that definition, making it more broad, you will allow the composition of the committee to accept individuals who have unique management experience, different perspectives, all of which, we're convinced, will enhance the ultimate AMS plan. Thank you.

CDR ENGLEBERT: Seeing no further comment, I just want to thank all of the speakers so far. They've been very succinct. I've had little need to use my visual tools, and I appreciate that. You also have been very good at telling us your comment and why you believe that your comment is important; in other words, I want this change because this. So at this

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

time, we're going to take a break. Now, the people are setting up coffee so we're a little bit early. Unfortunately, I suggest that we not bowl them over as they're trying to get the coffee cups set up for you. But I am going to break now until 11 o'clock.

(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the record at 10;47 a.m. and went back on the record at 11:05 a.m.)

CDR ENGLEBERT: All right. We're ready to resume. Please find your seat. I've asked the panelists to please come back to the podium. I'm going to start whether or not you're seated, and I'm going to start whether or not you can hear me. Thank you. The next section we're going to discuss and receive comment on -- and, yes, I was serious, I am starting. The next section that we're going to discuss is Part 104, found on Federal Register Page 39302 through 15. Comments for Subpart A and Subpart B will be accepted at this time.

Subpart A for Part 104 includes the definitions for this section, the applicability for this section, compliance dates, a discussion of waivers and equivalence, the requirements for alternative security programs, MARSEC directives and rights to appeal. Of course, the last three in this

NEAL R. GROSS